



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20287
Title of the Manuscript:	Specifying the Costs of Academic Training in Higher Education
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This is not a bad paper but it is not properly written in the form of an academic paper. There needs to be some effort to set the work in the context of existing literature, with a conceptual framework that highlights a gap in knowledge that the paper will hope to fill. As a technical report, the paper seems fine but as an academic paper, currently, it is deficient.	Thank you for your insightful comments and suggestions. We have consulted several articles published in the journal and tried to adopt a more appropriate form for the paper. We have revised the abstract and the introduction and also restructured the methodology section to provide more contextualization. We have also added to the discussion of the results and the conclusion to address your suggestions in terms of revision. We hope that the modifications and revisions made the style and content of the paper more academic.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		